



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,242	01/23/2002	Hong Thi Nguyen	BELL-0162/01329	8363

38952 7590 06/03/2004

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/055,242

Applicant(s)

NGUYEN ET AL.

Examiner

Rasha S AL-Aubaidi

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date # 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is unclear as to whether the subscriber is the calling party, called party or both? Which service is being subscribed? Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stevens et al (US PAT # 6,353,663).

Regarding claim 1, Stevens teaches a method for detecting a call made to a telephone station associated with a privacy screening service (see abstract) routed from a first telephone station (reads on calling party 10, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 2-3) to a second telephone station (reads on called party 12, Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 2-3) via a switching network, (this reads on either PSTN 14 in Fig. 1 or AIN, see col.2, lines 54-67) comprising: intercepting a call from a first telephone station (calling party 10) directed to a second telephone station (called party 12); determining if the second telephone (called party 12) station requires identification of the first telephone station for completion of the call (this reads on determining whether this is a desirable call from an authorized list or unwanted call, for example, telemarketer, see col. 2, lines 4-12, also col.3, lines 14-20) ; and in response to determining that the second telephone station (reads on the called party 12) requires identification of the first telephone (calling party 10) station for completion of the call, disconnecting the call (basically reads on the calling party or the system disconnecting the call, see col. 2, lines 4-7).

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claim 2, Stevens teaches intercepting the call from the first telephone station (calling party 10) to the second telephone station (called party 12) based on an indicator associated with the first telephone station (the indicator reads on setting up a

Art Unit: 2642

flagged in the case of receiving call from calling party 10 to the subscriber of the screening service, which is the called party 12, see col. 3, lines 2-13).

Regarding claim 3, Stevens teaches allowing the call to proceed if the directory number (reads on phone system number (PSN) is included in a list associated with the first telephone station (basically if the PSN of the calling party 10 is within authorized numbers in the database, the call will be connected to the called party 12, see col. 3, lines 13- 20).

Regarding claim 4, Stevens teaches in response to determining that the second telephone (called party 12) station does not require identification of the first telephone station, completing the call (this reads on the scenario of completing the call in standard manner in the event of an authorized callers).

Regarding claim 5, Stevens teaches sending an indicator (this reads on SRP 20 sends an instruction to billing office 22, see col. 3, lines 36-40 and Fig. 1) to a billing system to identify a call sent from the first telephone station (the calling party 10) to the second telephone station (the called party 12) wherein the second telephone station requires the identification of the first telephone station for completion of the call.

Regarding claim 6, Stevens teaches in an Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN, see col. 2, lines 56-60) having a service switching point (reads on SSP 16 in Fig. 1 and

Art Unit: 2642

col. 2, lines 56-59) and a service control point (SCP 18, Fig. 1), wherein said service switching point hosts an off-hook delay trigger (reads on TDP see col. 2, lines 60-63) associated with the first telephone station (calling party 10), and wherein said intercepting act comprises: actuating said off-hook delay trigger (this is inherent); and querying the service control point to obtain information associated with the second telephone station from a database stored at the services control point (see col. 2, lines 2-10).

Regarding claims 7-8, Stevens teaches in response to determining that the information associated with the second telephone station indicates that identifying information must be supplied by a calling party to the second telephone station before the call can be completed, disconnecting the call (this basically reads on either completing the call in or terminating the call at step 40, see col. 3, lines 6-36).

Regarding claims 10-11, Stevens teaches the AIN comprising a services node (this reads on IVP interactive voice prompting, see col. 2, lines 64-65), the services node including: a voice synthesizer, which generates an audible message (see col. 3, lines 25-32).

Regarding claim 12, Stevens teaches in the AIN the service control point (18) generates a message and sends the message to the service switching point (SSP 16)

Art Unit: 2642

for inclusion on a billing record created by the services switching point and sent to a billing system (see col. 2, lines 56-67 and col. 3, lines 36-49).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

McConnell (US PAT # 5,436,657) teaches subscribers input data into a centralized database of PSTN to control communication service. This data information may include information on how to route calls for restriction list of certain callers or an authorization list (see abstract of the invention).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (703) 605-5145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 10/055,242
Art Unit: 2642

Page 7

Examiner

Rasha S Al-Aubaidi

05/20/2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ahmad Matar", written in a cursive style.

AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600